

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed June 20, 2007. Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 15-23, 33, and 34 have been amended. Claims 3, 14, and 25 have been canceled. Therefore, Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15-24, and 26-33 remain pending in the application.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, in pertinent part, a method comprising “performing the task on the first computer system in response to the user input” and “retrieving the portable message from the message log; and executing the one or more instructions to perform the task on one or more additional computer systems.” Support for the amendment to claim 1 and for related amendments to claims 2, 12, 13, and 23 may be found in Applicant’s specification at least on page 60, lines 7-13 and in original claims 3, 14, and 25.

Claims 12, 13, and 15-22 have been amended to recite, in pertinent part, a “computer-readable storage medium.” Support for the amendments to claims 12, 13, and 15-22 may be found in Applicant’s specification at least on page 63, lines 1-6.

Objection to the Claims

Original claims 33 and 34 are objected to as being misnumbered due to the absence of original claim 32. Original claim 33 has been renumbered as claim 32, and original claim 34 has been renumbered as claim 33. Accordingly, removal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 9-15, 20-26, and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kenton (U.S. Patent No. 6,845,507). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in light of the following remarks.

Anticipation under § 102(e) requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). As discussed below, Kenton fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kenton does not teach or suggest a method comprising “performing the task on the first computer system in response to the user input” and “retrieving the portable message from the message log; and executing the one or more instructions to perform the task on one or more additional computer systems” in combination with the remaining features of claim 1. Kenton discloses a system for workflow automation in which workflow instructions are accessed from messages passed from one application to another (see, e.g., col. 3, line 47 to col. 4, line 2). Figs. 2 and 3 illustrate examples of workflows including various workflow tasks. Kenton also discloses that different tasks in a workflow may be performed respectively on different computer systems (see, e.g., Fig. 2). However, Kenton does not teach or suggest that the same task is performed on at least two different computer systems.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Kenton does not teach or suggest a method comprising “wherein the message comprises metadata which comprise identifying characteristics of the source application” in combination with the remaining features of claim 1. The Office Action argues that this limitation is taught by Kenton in col. 7, lines 55-58. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In the cited passage, Kenton discloses that a workflow message contains hierarchical data including a <Stage> tag that encloses a list of data needed for a task. Kenton further describes the tagged data as “data needed by the steps that a particular application must execute to fulfill its role in the process.” However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Kenton that the message identifies the particular application or otherwise comprises identifying characteristics of the source application.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, and 23 are patentably distinct from Kenton. An example of a dependent claim reciting further distinctions over the cited art is discussed below.

Regarding claim 2, Applicant respectfully submits that Kenton does not teach or suggest a method comprising “executing the one or more instructions to perform the task again on the first computer system” in combination with the remaining features of claim 2 and its base claim 1. The Office Action argues that this limitation is taught by Kenton in col. 6, lines 14-19. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In the cited passage, Kenton discloses updating a PMA database with data obtained in a previous task. Previous tasks in the workflow include querying the PMA database and querying a TMA database. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the same task is performed twice. Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion that the same task is performed twice on the same computer system. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2, 13, and 24 are patentably distinct from Kenton.

Applicant asserts that numerous others of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5-8, 16-19, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenton in view of Sweeney, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0032646, hereinafter “Sweeney”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in light of the following remarks.

Applicant asserts that numerous ones of claims 5-8, 16-19, and 27-30 recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of claims 5-8, 16-19, and 27-30 is not necessary at this time. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5602-11500/JCH.

Also filed herewith are the following items:

- ☐ Request for Continued Examination
- ☐ Terminal Disclaimer
- ☐ Power of Attorney By Assignee and Revocation of Previous Powers
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey C. Hood/

Jeffrey C. Hood, Reg. #35198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 2007-09-20 JCH/RPH